

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18 and 20-26 are currently pending.
- Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 22 and 23 are amended herein.
- New claims 24-26 are added herein.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22 and 23 is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 4, lines 25-29, page 8, lines 1-14, page 10, lines 20-28 and FIG. 6. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

New claims 24-26 are currently added herein. Support for these new claims is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 6, lines 9-20, page 8, lines 1-14 and FIG. 6. New claims 24-26 do not add any new subject matter.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Klevenz:** Klevenz, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137540
- **Baker:** Baker, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0047856

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18 and 20-23 are Non-Obvious Over Klevenz in view of Baker

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Klevenz in view of Baker. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

- one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the collection of data items, the one or more controller inputs configured to allow a user to navigate the collection of data items and to **select a display object corresponding to a data item from within the collection of data items;**
- the control component further configured to change an order of the data items in the collection of data items, and **move the data item to the front of the collection of data items responsive to receipt of user selection of the display object corresponding to the data item.**

Klevenz describes managing a user interface, including generating a page for a user interface, the page comprising a pane; receiving an indication of user interaction with a portion of the page; determining an event associated with the indicated interaction; and selectively generating a replacement pane based on the event determination. Klevenz, Abstract.

Baker describes providing web-based stacked image, which includes providing a database of image data, the image data representing a plurality of separate images, displaying at least a portion of the plurality of separate images, creating a stack of image data by individually selecting images from the displayed images, wherein each time an image is selected, the image data representing the selected image is pushed onto the stack of image data, the stack of image data including information defining an order in which the selected

images are to be displayed and assigning a tag to the stack of image data, uniquely identifying the stack of image data, the tag being included in the stack of image data. Baker, Abstract.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office cited paragraph [0065] of Klevenz as allegedly teaching a “selection of the collection of data items chang[ing] the order of the collection and mov[ing] the selected collection of data items to the front of the collection,” as recited in claim 1 prior to amendment. Office Action, page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution of this Application and without commenting the Office’s rejection, Applicant amends claim 1 herein to highlight differences between claim 1 and Klevenz.

Specifically, amended claim 1, currently recites in part, “navigat[ing] the collection of data items,” “select[ing] a display object corresponding to a data item from within the collection of data items,” and “mov[ing] the data item to the front of the collection of data items responsive to receipt of user selection of the display object corresponding to the data item,” as currently recited in claim 1. Paragraph [0065] of Klevenz merely describes determining whether an event corresponds to a next pane function and generating the next pane function if affirmative. Paragraph [0065] of Klevenz or elsewhere in Klevenz, however, fails to teach or suggest these above features of claim 1. More specifically, Klevenz could not have taught or suggested “navigating the collection of data items (or collection of panes including a replacement pane of Klevenz as allegedly asserted by the Office)” to “select a display object corresponding to a data item (or the replacement pane as allegedly asserted by the Office) from within the collection of data items,” and “mov[ing] the data item to the front of the collection of data items responsive to receipt of user selection of the display object

corresponding to the data item,” as recited in claim 1 because the collection of panes including the replacement pane of Klevenz could not possibly be navigated by a user of Klevenz before the collection of panes including the replacement pane are displayed in the first place.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Klevenz and Baker does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 1.

Dependent Claims 3-11 and 13-15

Claims 3-11 and 13-15 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 3-11 and 13-15 are allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 3-11 and 13-15.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, recites, in part:

- displaying a set of information items as a stack in an isometric three-space representation, the stack in the isometric three-space representation comprising a depth indicating the set of information items in the stack;

This above feature of claim 16 was not presented previously and therefore was not considered in the current Office Action.

Klevenz describes selectively generating a replacement pane based on an event determination which comprises determining whether the event is associated with replacing a

pane and generating a replacement pane if the event is associated with replacing the pane. Klevenz, paragraph [0007]. However, Klevenz does not disclose or suggest the feature of claim 1 quoted above.

Baker describes arranging a plurality of images in a stack and displaying the plurality of images in an order, with only a top image to be displayed at a time. Baker, paragraph [0017]. Klevenz and Baker, either in combination or taken alone however, fail to teach or suggest “a stack in an isometric three-space representation,” let alone “displaying a set of information items as a stack in an isometric three-space representation, the stack in the isometric three-space representation comprising a depth indicating the set of information items in the stack,” as currently recited in claim 16.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Klevenz and Baker does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 16.

Independent Claim 17

Claim 17, as currently amended, recites in part (added text underlined):

- receiving an indication from a first control for selecting a stack of display items ... the stack [being] a graphical representation of the display items comprising the differing applications; ...
- receiving an indication from a third control for gathering dissimilar items in a set of items to consequently preview the items;
- employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items, wherein selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack;

In rejecting claim 17, the Office cited Klevenz and Baker as allegedly teaching the features of this claim. Office Action, pages 12-14. Applicant respectfully disagrees. An excerpt of the Office's argument presented on pages 12-14 of the Office Action is given as follows:

Regarding claim 17, Klevenz discloses computer readable storage media comprising computer executable instructions that when executed by a processor perform steps, comprising: selecting a stack of display items with a first control "a user interface state comprises a navigation state stored in a stack structure, and placing information about a replacement pane in a user interface state comprises pushing information about the replacement pane onto the stack structure", (Par. 0015)

and cycling the stack of display items "a user interface state comprises a navigation state stored in a stack structure, and placing information about a replacement pane in a user interface state comprises pushing information about the replacement pane onto the stack structure", (Par. 0015)

with a second control in order to provide an information preview with respect to at least one of the items "user interface 114 includes a page 116, also known as a screen, that is itself composed of panes 118. A pane may be rectangular, square, elliptical, circular, or any other appropriate shape. As illustrated, pane 118a contains pane 118b and pane 118c. Additionally, pane 118b contains controls 120a-b and pane 118c contains control 120c. A control is basically a container for widgets that are displayed in the user interface. Thus, a control could be a composite of input fields, labels, buttons, and other fields. An example of controls is a "name" control and an "address" control for a shipping function. The "address" control, for instance, may contain five widgets: two input fields for entering street address, one drop-down box for choosing state, one input field for entering zip code, and one "ok" button to indicate that the address is complete. As illustrated by the controls example, user interface 114 may also facilitate the receipt of input from a user, such as, for example, the input of information and the selection of an action associated with information and/or a control", (Par. 0042),

Klevenz does not explicitly disclose the display items being differing applications. Furthermore Klevenz does not disclose the displaying based on metadata tags describing a history of interaction between a user and the set of information items.

Baker discloses a method of providing web -based stacked images (i.e. collection of data items) includes providing a database of image data, the image data representing a plurality of separate images, displaying at least a portion of the plurality of separate images, creating a stack of image data by individually selecting images from the displayed images, wherein each time an

image is selected, the image data representing the selected image is pushed onto the stack of image data (i.e. currently selected information item with the remaining information items such the [[the]] selected information items is left atop the stack) the stack of image data including information defining an order in which the selected images are to be displayed and assigning a tag to the stack of image data, uniquely identifying the stack of image data, the tag being included in the stack of image data (Abstract, Fig. 1). Baker discloses display stacked images and data relating to the image (S19, Fig. 1) and [[an]] unrelated images (S20, Fig. 1). Baker discloses are different application program images (Par. 0043, Par. 0055). Furthermore Baker discloses the user can override the default order in which the images are placed in the stack, resorting the images or skipping over images based on individual preference. For example, the user's preference can be stored in standard cookie format on the user's computer. As shown in FIG. 4, if the stack is to be placed in a special order (Yes, Step S44) (e.g., based on previous user preference, etc), the user's computer is checked for a local cookie (Step S46). The local cookie may contain information indicating past user preferences. The stack is then reordered in accordance with the past user preferences (i.e. metadata tags further describing a history of interaction between a user and the collections of data items, Par. 0054)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the stacked/unstacked application program images as taught by Baker with the finer grained navigation of Klevenz to effectively reorder a collection of items.

As can be seen from the above excerpt of the Office Action, however, the Office failed to articulate its reasons to reject “the stack [being] a graphical representation of the display items comprising the differing applications,” “a third control for gathering dissimilar items in a set of items to consequently preview the items,” and “employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items, wherein selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack,” as recited in claim 17 (prior to amendment). More specifically, the Office failed to provide evidence as to where and/or how Klevenz and Baker teach or suggest the above

features of claim 17. Since no rejections are given for these features of claim 17, claim 17 is believed to be allowable for its recitation of features that are not rejected in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Klevenz and Baker failed to teach or suggest the above features of claim 17. For example, neither Klevenz nor Baker teaches or suggests “employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items, wherein selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack,” as previously recited in claim 17. More specifically, Klevenz fails to teach or suggest “employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items,” let alone “selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack,” as recited in claim 17. Moreover, Baker merely describes flipping through stacked images by placing a cursor on the top image and right clicking on the top image. Baker, paragraph [0042]. Baker, however, fails to teach or suggest “employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items,” wherein selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack,” as recited in claim 17.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Klevenz and Baker does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17 (prior to or after this amendment). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 17.

Dependent Claims 18, 20 and 21

Claims 18, 20 and 21 ultimately depend from independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 18, 20 and 21 are allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 18, 20 and 21.

Independent Claim 22

Claim 22, as amended herein, recites, in part:

- a display object for displaying a group of pages as a stack in an isometric three-space representation, the stack in the isometric three-space representation comprising a depth indicating the group of pages in the stack;

Similar to the reasons discussed with respect to claim 16, Klevenz and Baker fail to teach or suggest “a display object for displaying a group of pages as a stack in an isometric three-space representation, the stack in the isometric three-space representation comprising a depth indicating the group of pages in the stack,” as currently recited in claim 22. For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Klevenz and Baker does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 22.

Dependent Claim 23

Claim 23 ultimately depends from independent claim 22. As discussed above, claim 22 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 23 is allowable over the cited

documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 23.

New Claims 24-26

New claims 24-26 are currently added herein. New claims 24-26 ultimately depend from claims 16 and 17 respectively. As discussed above, claims 16 and 17 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, new claims 24-26 are allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/David A. Divine, Reg. No. 51,275/
David A. Divine
(Daved@leehayes.com; 509-944-4733)
Registration No. 51275

Dated: December 16, 2010